

	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/898,209	09/19/2001	Song Kim	7091-103/10102873.4 NJ	5641
75 EUT BRIGHT	90 01/30/2002 & JAWORSKI L.I	EXAMINER		
29th Floor 865 S. Figueroa	Street	RECEIVED	NGUYEN,	TRINH T
Los Angeles, C.	A 90017	RECE.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•	5 2002	3726	
,		LED TEMOBER	DATE MAILED: 01/30/200	2
	<u>.</u>	FEB 5 2002 FILBRIGHT & JAWORSKI		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

BERLINER &ASSOCIATES

• -				(~_ <i>a</i> :			
Office Action Co.			Application No. 09/893,209	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s): Kim			
	Office Action Summa		Exeminer Trinh Nguye		Art Unit 3726			
	The MAILING DATE of this comm	unication appears	on the cover sheet wi	ith the corre	spondence addr	099		
A SH THE - Exte	for Reply HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNI ensions of time may be available under the ifter SIX (6) MONTHS from the meiling dat	NICATION. e provisions of 37 C ete of this communic	CFR 1.136 (a). In no ever	ent, however, i	may a reply be tir			
- If the be - If NC - co - Failu - Any es	se period for reply specified above is fees the considered timely. O period for reply is specified above, the meanmunication. The to reply within the set or extended perion reply received by the Office later than threatned patent term adjustment. See 37 CF	than thirty (30) days maximum statutory priod for reply will, by ree months after the	s, a reply within the statu period will apply and will by statute, cause the appli	ill expire SIX (6	6) MONTHS from	the mailing date of this		
Status 1) 💢		iled on <u>Sep 19, ;</u>	2001			<u>.</u> .		
2a} □	This action is FINAL.	2b) ☑ This ac	ction is non-final.			_		
3) 🗆								
Disposi	ition of Claims		•					
4) 🔯	Claim(s) 1-8			is/are	a pending in the	e application.		
4	4a) Of the above, claim(s) <u>4-8</u>		•		•			
	Claim(s)							
	Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.							
			is/are objected to.					
	Claims							
	ation Papers							
· · ·	The specification is objected to by	the Examiner.						
_	The drawing(s) filed on		objected to by the E	-xaminer.				
	The proposed drawing correction fi	·	-		b)☐ disapprov	red .		
_	The oath or declaration is objected			~F	2 ,— • • • • • •	· ·		
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
13)□	Acknowledgement is made of a cla ☐ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None o		riority under 35 U.S.(C. § 119(a)-	-(d).			
	1. ☐ Certifled copies of the priority		re heen received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority			nnlication N	la.	_		
3	3. Copies of the certified copies application from the in	of the priority donternational Burea	ocuments have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a))	received in		itage		
	se the attached detailed Office action Acknowledgement is made of a claim							
	Acknowledgement is made of a cla	M TOF QUIDESUC	priority under 35 0.3	J.C. 3 115(e	2).			
Attachma					-			
	price of References Cited (PTC-892)		19) Interview Summary (P	· ·				
	otice of Dreftspetson's Patent Orawing Ravisw (PTO- formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper		19] Notice of Informal Pat	tent Application (PTO-152)			
	Supplied and control of the control	NO(\$),	20) Other:					

Page 2

Art Unit:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-3, drawn to a roller, classified in class 492, subclass 13.
 - II. Claims 4-8, drawn to a method of fabricating a roller, classified in class 29, subclass 895.
- 2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

 Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are

 distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be

 used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be

 made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the

 process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product such as a roller

 used in scrubbing instead of painting.
- 3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Page 3

Art Unit:

- 5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 6. During a telephone conversation with Attorney Berliner on 1/23/02 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-3. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 4-8 have been withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 250 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 250 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

8. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors, Applicant's cooperation is requested and appreciated in correcting any errors of which Applicant may become aware in the specification.

2135334174

Page 4

Art Unit:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 9. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Serwer (US 3,030,696).

As shown in clearly in Figures 1, 2, and 4, and lines 1-55 of col. 2, Serwer clearly teaches all the limitations as claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 11. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Serwer (US 3,030,696).

Serwer discloses the claimed invention except for the base material comprises cotton. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

2135334174

Page 5

Art Unit:

made to have made Serwer's base material (11) out of cotton, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure and are cited on form PTO-892 encloses herewith.

Official documents related to the instant application may be submitted to the Technology Center 3700 mail center by facsimile at (703) 305-3579/3580.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trinh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-9082.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

ttn

January 25, 2002